REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 16, and 17 are independent. Claims 17-24 have been added to more particularly define what Applicant regards as his invention.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 7-15 recite allowable subject matter and would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. For the reasons discussed below, however, Applicant respectfully asserts that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance.

Art Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Buzsaki (U.S. Patent 6,334,193). Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buzsaki in view of Batra (U.S. Patent 5,673,386). These rejections, insofar as them pertain to the presently pending claims, are respectfully traversed.

Buzsaki is directed to a method of implementing user-definable error handling processes. The problem identified in the

13

conventional art by Buzsaki and which is addressed by his invention is that conventional systems do not allow the end-user to define a custom error handling routine. See column 1, lines 45-53.

To solve the problem, Buzsaki permits a user to define multiple custom error handling processes. Significantly, these custom error handling processes are associated with a particular error or activity (see column 1, lines 56-60). This is discussed in more detail in column 2, lines 57-62 which is quoted below as follows:

> "Based on various errors or other failures that may occur in a system, the end-user is able to associate a particular error handling process with each possible error or activity. An activity may by any process, procedure, command, instruction, function, or other operation that may be performed by a system."

In other words, Buzsaki determines which error handling process to utilize for the activity currently being performed by the computer system.

In contrast, the presently claimed invention utilizes the operational mode of an information handling system to determine which type of fault handling processing should be utilized to handle the error. More specifically, and as recited in claim 1, the invention uniquely defines a fault management table that stores

14

operation mode information indicating an operating mode of the information processing system. This claimed fault management table further relates the operation mode to the type of fault handling processing system. Such a data relationship permits the fault handling facility to determine which type of fault handling processing should be utilized for a given operation mode.

It is asserted that Buzsaki does not disclose or suggest any such fault management table, particularly a fault management table that relates operation mode to the type of fault handling processing or which utilizes such a fault management table to obtain the type of fault handling processing that corresponds to the operation mode of the information handling system. Clearly, Buzsaki relies upon the activity (process, procedure, command, instruction, function or other operation that may be performed by the system) currently being executed to determine a particular error handling process that should be utilized to correct the error. Such "activities" are essentially the current process being performed by the computer which is a distinct concept from the operation mode disclosed and claimed by the present invention.

As further disclosed in Buzsaki, if multiple error handling processes are associated with a given activity, then Buzsaki then relies upon certain "parameters" and "attributes" to determine

15

which of these multiple error handling processes should be utilized for the associated activity. In other words, if and only if a particular activity (not an operation mode) results in a choice of multiple error handling processes then Buzsaki utilizes certain parameters and attributes to determine the optimum error handling process.

These "parameters" and "attributes" and Buzsaki's process are discussed in column 4, lines 28-40 which further describes the parameters and attributes as time of day and system utilization. Even if these time of day and system utilization parameters and attributes are considered to be operational modes (which they clearly are not) these parameters and attributes are only utilized after Buzsaki determines that there is a choice of multiple error handling processes and the initial choice is based upon the current activity of the computer.

In other words, Buzsaki essentially discloses a two step process the first step of which relies upon the current computer activity to determine which error handling process to utilize. If the result of this first step is a choice between multiple error handling procedures, then time of day and system utilization type parameters or attributes are utilized to choose between the choices from the first step. In any case, the activity, parameters, or

16

attributes are not equivalent to and do not disclose or suggest an operation mode for an information handling system, particularly as that term is used and defined in the present invention.

Buzsaki further discusses this second step (implemented by process engine 110) as being capable of selecting among multiple error handling processes "associated with a particular activity when an error occurs executing that activity." (column 5, lines 55-57). This quotation makes it extremely clear that Buzsaki's activity is the particular software process or module being executed by the computer system. An error in the activity (software process) will determine which error handling process to utilize. This is quite a distinct concept from the present invention which utilizes the overall operational mode of the information handling system to determine the type of fault handling process to utilize to handle the error and the fault.

Buzsaki may also determine that there is a choice of error handling processes associated with a particular activity (software process). If so, then Buzsaki also looks to certain error handling parameters such as the activity generating the error, the instance of the process that generated the error, the name or identifier of the error that occurred, the identity of a person to notify, and the list of system status information at the time the error

17

occurred. (Column 6, lines 1-5). All of these error handling parameters relate to the particular activity (not operational mode) of the computer. As such, Buzsaki does not disclose or suggest using an operation mode of an information handling system to choose between various types of fault handling processing to handle the fault.

Furthermore, the inventive method recited in independent claim 16 is also patentably distinct form the applied art. For example, none of the applied art discloses or suggests defining operation mode information indicating an operating mode of an information processing system. The concept of operating mode is simply absent from Buzsaki or Batra, taken alone or in combination.

Furthermore, none of the applied art discloses or suggests storing the operation mode information and the type of fault handling processing *with the operation mode information being related with the type of fault handling processing.* Because the concept of operation mode is absent from the applied art and because there is no data relation between operating mode and type of fault handling processing found or suggested in any of the applied art, the combination of these references must fail.

Still further, none of the applied art discloses or suggests determining the type of fault handling processing corresponding to

18

the operation mode information obtained as still further recited in independent claim 16.

As noted above, none of the applied art discloses or suggests the claim features specifically pointed out above. Although the arguments above primarily focus on Buzsaki, Applicant also asserts that Batra does not remedy any of the noted deficiencies in Buzsaki. Indeed, Batra is merely applied to teach that error handling parameters may include fault class information indicating a degree of seriousness of the fault. Operational mode is not disclosed or suggested by Batra and there is not relating of operation mode to a type of fault handling processing, particularly as recited in independent claims 1 and 16. Because none of the applied art teaches or suggests the features pointed out above, the combination of the two patents also does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention.

For all of the above reasons, taken alone or in combination, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the art rejection.

Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully

requested to contact Michael R. Cammarata (Reg. No. 39,491) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By_____
Michael R. Cammarata, #39,491

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

MRC/kpc

(Rev. 09/30/03)

20